arXiv:1510.04776v3 [math.PR] 15 Jan 2016

SCALING LIMIT OF TWO-COMPONENT INTERACTING BROWNIAN MOTIONS

INSUK SEO

Abstract. This paper presents our study of the asymptotic behavior of a two-component system of Brownian motions undergoing certain singular interactions. In particular, the system is a combination of two different types of particles and the mechanical properties and interaction parameters depend on the corresponding type of particles. We prove that the hydrodynamic limit of the empirical densities of two types is the solution of a certain quasi-linear parabolic partial differential equation known as the Maxwell-Stefan equation.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Model and Main Results 3
3. Hydrodynamic Limit 8
4. Uniqueness 19
5. Concluding Remarks 24
Appendix: Proof of Theorem 3.7 26
References 31

1. Introduction

Our primary concern in this study is the large-scale behavior of the system of locally interacting Brownian motions(LIBM) consisting of two different types of particles. Originally, the *one-component* (*i.e.,* homogeneous) LIBM system was introduced by [9, 10], in which the limit theory for the tagged particle in non-equilibrium dynamics

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 82C22, 60F10, 35K55, 35Q72 .
Key words and phrases. Interacting Brownian motion, two-component system, hydrodynamic limit, strongly coupled parabolic systems, Maxwell-Stefan equation.

was established. Recently, [24] developed a corresponding large deviation principle by analyzing the so-called *colored system*. In this system, all the particles have the same mechanical property but are painted either black or white. The significant feature of this type of system is its non-gradientness[1]. In particular, applying the general non-gradient method (*cf.* [27]) to the colored system is known to be a difficult task, and accordingly, the limit theory and the large deviation principle for the colored system is known only for the symmetric simple exclusion process(SSEP) [21], zero-range process(ZRP) [6] and LIBM [24].

One can also imagine a system in which particles of different colors have different mechanical properties. Such a system is known as a *two-component system*. This generalization adds additional technical difficulties to the non-gradientness and a successful analysis is known only for the ZRP. In particular [7] and [11] studied diffusive and Eulerian scaling limit, respectively. At the time when this paper is written, the result of [7] is the only hydrodynamic limit theory for two-component system and we shall develop the second result in the current article. The limit theory for a two-component SSEP is still open and there exists limited related research. In [5], the authors studied a mutually interacting two-component SSEP where two types of particles affect each other through their jump rates. Sasada [23] studied a two-component SSEP in the presence of simultaneous births, deaths, and switching of different types of particles. In this model, the difference between the limiting particle density of two types, namely $\rho = \rho_1 - \rho_2$, is a conserved quantity and the author derived the hydrodynamic limit equation for ρ. The equation for ρ_1 and ρ_2 in this model is also not known.

In the current work, we develop the hydrodynamical limit for the two-component LIBM system and then discuss some general features and technical difficulties for this kind of problem.

We now briefly explain the structure of the article. In Section 2, we present a precise definition of the model and state the results we obtained. In Section 3, we establish the hydrodynamic limit of the system, which amounts to the main result. In particular, the hydrodynamic equation is of the form

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\begin{pmatrix}\rho_1\\ \rho_2\end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2}\nabla\cdot\left[D(\rho_1,\,\rho_2)\nabla\begin{pmatrix}\rho_1\\ \rho_2\end{pmatrix}\right] \tag{1.1}$$

[1]The only exception is the colored zero-range process which is a gradient type.

where ρ_1, ρ_2 are limiting particle densities of type 1, 2, respectively and $D(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ is the 2×2 cross-diffusion matrix which can be computed explicitly(*cf.* (2.14)). Of course, the uniqueness of the weak solution for equation (1.1) is an essential step. However, we emphasize here that the diffusion matrix $D(\cdot, \cdot)$ is not symmetric and $\frac{1}{2}(D + D^\dagger)$ is not even positive-definite and accordingly, the theory of the parabolic partial differential equation(PDE) cannot be used in our situation. Instead, an equation of the form (1.1) is a so-called cross-diffusion equation and we will use the general theory of [1] to derive the local uniqueness. The global weak uniqueness for a cross-diffusion system such as (1.1) is not very well known, and as a consequence, the results we obtained for the general initial condition is local-in-time. Fortunately, this result can be extended to the global result if the initial condition is close enough to the equilibrium, *i.e.*, constant function. We believe that most multi-component interacting particle systems, as is also apparent for ZRP due to result of [7], share this feature. We discuss these issues in Section 4.

We finally remark here that equation (1.1) with our cross-diffusion matrix is the so-called *Maxwell-Stefan equation*.

2. Model and Main Results

2.1. **Two-component locally interacting Brownian motions.** We start by defining LIBM consisting of two different types of particles on the one-dimensional torus $\mathbb{T}$, and by introducing some relevant notions. Our definition is quite similar to that of one-component LIBM [9, 24], and the reader may refer to corresponding papers for exhaustive explanations.

2.1.1. *Types of particles.* Our model consists of N interacting particles $x_1^N(t), \cdots, x_N^N(t)$ on $\mathbb{T}$ and each particle belongs to one of two given types, namely type 1 and 2. We denote by $\mathcal{T}_1^N$, $\mathcal{T}_2^N$, the bipartition of $\{1, 2, \cdots, N\}$, the index sets of type 1 and 2, respectively. In other words, $\{x_i^N(t) : i \in \mathcal{T}_c^N\}$ is the set of particles of type c for $c = 1, 2$. The diffusivity of the particle of type c is $\sigma_c^2 > 0$ and $\sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2$[2].

In addition, the interaction also depends on the particle type. In the local interaction model, two particles always reflect each other regardless of their types when they collide, but sometimes they change their labels. To be precise, we first measure the collision

[2]If $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$, then the model is reduced into the one-component and two-color system [24]

time between two particles $x_i^N(\cdot)$ and $x_j^N(\cdot)$ up to time t by local times $A_{ij}(t)$ and $A_{ji}(t)$, depending on their relative positions infinitesimally before the collision:

$$A_{ij}(t) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \int_0^t \frac{\mathbb{1}_{[0,\epsilon]}(x_i(s) - x_j(s))}{2\epsilon} ds$$
$$A_{ji}(t) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \int_0^t \frac{\mathbb{1}_{[0,\epsilon]}(x_j(s) - x_i(s))}{2\epsilon} ds.$$

In the one-component model [9, 24], the label switching occurs as a Poisson process with constant intensity λN along some local time clock. In the two-component model, however, the interaction parameter λ depends on the types of particles involved. If the types of colliding particles $x_i^N(\cdot)$ and $x_j^N(\cdot)$ are c_1 and c_2, then the rates of the Poisson process are $\lambda_{c_1,\,c_2} N$ and $\lambda_{c_2,\,c_1} N$ along the local times $A_{ij}(t)$ and $A_{ji}(t)$, respectively. We will assume the symmetry $\lambda_{1,\,2} = \lambda_{2,\,1}$ in this work, *i.e.*, the interaction does not distinguish between the relative inter-particle positions when they collide.

2.1.2. *Formulation of particle system.* Rigorous formulation can be carried out in a similar manner to the one-component model [9, 24]. We first restate some of their relevant notions to make our exposition self-contained. Let G_N be a N-manifold

$$G_N = \{x = (x_1,\, x_2,\, \cdots,\, x_n) \in \mathbb{T}^N \,:\, x_i \neq x_j \text{ for all } i \neq j\}.$$

The boundary ∂G_N of G_N can be decomposed into

$$\partial G_N = \bigcup_{i<j} \{x : x_i = x_j\} = \bigcup_{i \neq j} F_{ij}$$

where F_{ij} and F_{ji} are two sides of $\{x : x_i = x_j\}$ where F_{ij} is the side that satisfying $x_j = x_i + 0$. Denote the space of piecewise smooth functions on G_N that are smooth up to the boundary by $\bar{C}(G_N)$. For $f \in \bar{C}(G_N)$, we define

$$f_{ij}(x) = f(\cdots,\, x_{i-1},\, x_i + 0,\, x_{i+1}, \cdots,\, x_{j-1},\, x_i - 0,\, x_{j+1},\, \cdots) \tag{2.1}$$
$$D_{ij} f(x) = (\sigma_{c(i)}^2 \nabla_i - \sigma_{c(j)}^2 \nabla_j) f(\cdots,\, x_{i-1}\, x_i + 0,\, x_{i+1}, \cdots,\, x_{j-1},\, x_i - 0,\, x_{j+1},\, \cdots) \tag{2.2}$$

for $x \in F_{ij}$ where $c(i)$, throughout this article, represents the type of particle $x_i^N(\cdot)$.

Now, the interacting particles system

$$x^N(t) = (x_1^N(t),\, x_2^N(t),\, \cdots,\, x_N^N(t))$$

can be regarded as a diffusion process on $\mathbb{T}^N$ with the generator

$$\mathscr{L}_N f = \frac{\sigma_1^2}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1^N} \Delta_i f + \frac{\sigma_2^2}{2} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{T}_2^N} \Delta_j f = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sigma_{c(i)}^2 \Delta_i f \tag{2.3}$$

where the domain $\mathcal{D}(\mathscr{L}_N)$ consists of functions $f \in \bar{C}(G_N)$ that satisfy the boundary condition $\mathfrak{U}_{ij} f(x) = 0$ on F_{ij} for each $i \neq j$ where

$$\mathfrak{U}_{ij} f(x) = D_{ij} f(x) - \lambda_{c(i),\, c(j)} N (f_{ij}(x) - f_{ji}(x)). \tag{2.4}$$

This infinitesimal generator $(\mathscr{L}_N,\, \mathcal{D}(\mathscr{L}_N))$ defines the process $x^N(t)$.

Alternative construction of the particle system can be achieved by the martingale formulation [13], as noted by [9]. In other words, we can define the process on $\mathbb{T}^N$ by the measure $\mathbb{P}_N$ on $C([0,\, T],\, \mathbb{T}^N)$ for some fixed final time T which is a solution of a certain martingale problem. More precisely, under $\mathbb{P}_N$, we have a filtration $\{\mathscr{F}_t : t \in [0,\, T]\}$ and local times $\left\{A_{ij}^N(t) : 1 \leq i \neq j \leq N\right\}$ such that for any $f \in \bar{C}\,(G_N)$,

$$\begin{aligned} M_f(t) =& f(x^N(t)) - f(x^N(0)) \\ & - \left[\int_0^t \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sigma_{c(i)}^2 \Delta_i f(x^N(s)) ds + \sum_{i \neq j} \int_0^t \mathfrak{U}_{ij} f(x^N(s)) dA_{ij}^N(s) \right] \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

is a martingale with respect to the filtration $\{\mathscr{F}_t\}_{0 \leq t \leq T}$. This martingale has an alternative expression such that

$$M_f(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sigma_{c(i)} \int_0^t \nabla_i f(x^N(s)) d\beta_i(s) + \sum_{i \neq j} \int_0^t (f_{ij} - f_{ji}) \left[dM_{ij}^N(s) - dM_{ji}^N(s) \right] \tag{2.6}$$

where $\beta_i(t)$ are independent Brownian motions and $\left\{M_{ij}^N(t)\right\}_{i \neq j}$ is a family of pairwise orthogonal compensated Poisson jump processes with rate $\left\{\lambda_{c(i),\, c(j)} N A_{ij}^N(t)\right\}_{i \neq j}$. In this way we obtain the two-component system as a process $\mathbb{P}_N$ on $[0,\, T] \times \mathbb{T}^N$ and we write $\mathbb{E}_N$ the expectation with respect to this process.

Remark 2.1. The particle system consisting of $m(\geq 3)$ different types can be defined similarly.

2.2. **Main results.** The main result is described by first defining some notions and explaining essential technical assumptions on the initial distribution. The empirical

density of each type c is defined by

$$\mu_c^N(t) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_c^N} \delta_{x_i^N(t)} \,;\; c = 1,\, 2 \tag{2.7}$$

and then the empirical density of the entire system can be written as

$$\tilde{\mu}^N(t) = \left(\mu_1^N(t),\, \mu_2^N(t)\right)^\dagger. \tag{2.8}$$

Let $\mathbb{Q}_N$ be the measure on $C([0,\, T],\, \mathscr{M}(\mathbb{T})^2)$ induced by $\tilde{\mu}^N(\cdot)$. Then, our goal is to characterize the limit point of $\{\mathbb{Q}_N\}_{N=1}^\infty$ as a Dirac mass on the unique solution of a certain PDE. We then obtain the concrete result, by making the following assumptions on the initial system configuration.

Assumption 2.2. *The initial empirical density $\tilde{\mu}^N(0)$ satisfies the law of large number in the sense that*

$$\tilde{\mu}^N(0) \rightharpoonup \tilde{\rho}^0(x)dx = \left(\rho_1^0(x)dx,\, \rho_2^0(x)dx\right)^\dagger \tag{2.9}$$

weakly in $\mathscr{M}(\mathbb{T})^2$ for some non-negative function $\tilde{\rho}^0(x) \in W_1^p(\mathbb{T})^2$ for some $p > 2$.

Assumption 2.3. *$\tilde{\mu}^N(0)$ satisfies (2.9) with $\tilde{\rho}^0(x) \in H_2^2$ (as usual, $H_k = W_k^2$). Furthermore, there exist constants $\hat{\rho}_1,\, \hat{\rho}_2 > 0$ such that*

$$\left\|\rho_1^0(x) - \hat{\rho}_1\right\|_{H_2} + \left\|\rho_2^0(x) - \hat{\rho}_2\right\|_{H_2} < \epsilon(\lambda,\, \sigma_1,\, \sigma_2)$$

for some small constant $\epsilon(\lambda,\, \sigma_1,\, \sigma_2)$. This constant will be explained in Section 4.3.

Assumption 2.4. *Let $f_N^0(\cdot)$ be the probability density function of $x^N(0) = (x_1^N(0),\, \cdots,\, x_N^N(0))$. Then,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^N} f_N^0(x) \log f_N^0(x) dx \le CN \tag{2.10}$$

for all N for some constant C.

The following are a few remarks on these assumptions.

- Assumptions 2.2 and 2.3 provide the initial conditions of the PDE for the limiting particle density. The corresponding regularities are only required in the uniqueness result of Section 4. The results of Section 3 would be valid even under any alternative starting non-negative *measure* $\rho_c^0(dx)$, instead.
- By pairing the weak convergence of (2.9) with the constant function 1, we derive

$$\left|\mathcal{T}_c^N\right| = \bar{\rho}_c N + o(N) \tag{2.11}$$

where $\bar{\rho}_c = \int_{\mathbb{T}} \rho_c^0(x)$ is the average density of type c.

- Assumption 2.4 is known as the entropy condition that appears in many literatures of interacting system [12, 27]. This assumption enable us to use the logarithmic Sobolev inequality of Section 3.1.1 to build the replacement lemma in terms of the Dirichlet form [12]. This assumption is also useful when we prove the tightness of $\{\mathbb{Q}_N\}_{N=1}^{\infty}$ in Section 3.
- Of course, *i.i.d.* configuration satisfies (2.10).

Finally, throughout this article, we take the normalization

$$\lambda_{1,2} = \lambda_{2,1} = \lambda\sigma_1^2\sigma_2^2. \tag{2.12}$$

simply for the sake of the convenience. The main result is the following theorem.

Theorem 2.5. *Under Assumption 2.4, $\{\mathbb{Q}_N\}_{N=1}^{\infty}$ is tight and every limit points are supported on the set of weak solutions of*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\begin{pmatrix}\rho_1\\ \rho_2\end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2}\nabla\cdot\left[D(\rho_1,\,\rho_2)\nabla\begin{pmatrix}\rho_1\\ \rho_2\end{pmatrix}\right] \tag{2.13}$$

with initial condition $\tilde{\rho}^0(\cdot)$ where the cross-diffusion matrix $D(\rho_1,\,\rho_2)$ is given by

$$D(\rho_1,\,\rho_2) = \frac{1}{\lambda + \frac{\rho_1}{\sigma_1^2} + \frac{\rho_2}{\sigma_2^2}}\begin{pmatrix}\rho_1 + \lambda\sigma_1^2 & \rho_1\\ \rho_2 & \rho_2 + \lambda\sigma_2^2\end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.14}$$

Furthermore,

(1) *(Local result for general initial condition) Under Assumption 2.2, there exist $t^+(\tilde{\rho}^0) > 0$ such that the equation (2.13) has the unique weak solution[3] in $[0,\, t^+(\tilde{\rho}^0)]$. Therefore, $\{\mathbb{Q}_N\}_{N=1}^{\infty}$ converges weakly to the Dirac mass concentrated on this unique solution if $T \le t^+(\tilde{\rho}^0)$.*

(2) *(Global result for initial condition close to equilibrium) Under Assumption 2.3, the weak solution of (2.13) is unique in $[0,\, T]$ for any $T > 0$ and $\{\mathbb{Q}_N\}_{N=1}^{\infty}$ converges to the Dirac mass concentrated on this unique solution.*

We provide the detailed proof of this theorem in Sections 3 and 4.

[3]This solution is also strong.

3. Hydrodynamic Limit

In this section, we prove Theorem 2.5. Throughout this section, we implicitly assume Assumption 2.4.

Our specific concern is the asymptotic behavior of the empirical density $\tilde{\mu}^N(t)$ (*cf.* (2.8)). The crucial observation is that $\tilde{\mu}^N(t)$ is not affected by switching the labels between particles of the same type; hence, interactions among these particles certainly do not affect our concern. In turn, neither the assumptions nor the conclusion is influenced even if we set the self-interaction parameters $\lambda_{1,1}$ and $\lambda_{2,2}$ as

$$\lambda_{1,1} = \lambda\sigma_1^4, \quad \lambda_{2,2} = \lambda\sigma_2^4. \tag{3.1}$$

This specific selection of parameters plays a significant role in the computations of Section 3.2 and henceforth we assume (3.1) throughout the remainder of the article.

Remark 3.1. By (2.12) and (3.1), we can write the interaction parameter between $x_i^N(\cdot)$ and $x_j^N(\cdot)$ as $\lambda\sigma_{c(i)}^2\sigma_{c(j)}^2$.

In Section 3.1 we first develop some essential estimates, based on which we then establish the hydrodynamic limit in Section 3.2.

3.1. **Preliminary estimates.**

In Sections 2 and 3 of [24], several estimates for the usual LIBM have been developed either in terms of the Dirichlet form or in the super-exponential sense. Fortunately, after making a small adjustment to ensure Assumption 2.4 is taken into account, both types of estimates can be used for the two-component model. To explain this carefully, we first establish a logarithmic Sobolev inequality in Section 3.1.1. Then, we prove the tightness of $\{\mathbb{Q}_N\}_{N=1}^{\infty}$ and a kind of replacement lemma in the context of hydrodynamic limit theory [12] in Sections 3.1.2 and 3.1.4, respectively. An auxiliary martingale is introduced in Section 3.1.3 which plays a crucial role in our exposition.

3.1.1. *Logarithmic Sobolev inequality.*

We first explain the Dirichlet form and entropy of the system. By Remark 3.1, we can write the Dirichlet form corresponding to the system defined in Section 2.1 as

$$\mathscr{D}_N(f) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{G_N} \frac{\sigma_{c(i)}^2}{2} (\nabla_i f)^2 dx + \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{\lambda N \sigma_{c(i)}^2 \sigma_{c(j)}^2}{2} \int_{F_{ij}} (f_{ij} - f_{ji})^2 dS_{ij}(x) \tag{3.2}$$

where $dS_{ij}(x)$ is the Lebesgue measure on F_{ij} normalized to have a total measure of 1.

Remark 3.2. We can observe from (3.2) that our system is reversible with respect to the uniform measure dx on $\mathbb{T}^N$.

Let us define $\mathcal{D}_N(f) = \mathscr{D}_N(\sqrt{f})$ so that

$$\mathcal{D}_N(f) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{G_N} \frac{\sigma_{c(i)}^2}{8} \frac{(\nabla_i f)^2}{f} dx + \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{\lambda N \sigma_{c(i)}^2 \sigma_{c(j)}^2}{2} \int_{F_{ij}} \left(\sqrt{f_{ij}} - \sqrt{f_{ji}} \right)^2 dS_{ij}(x). \quad (3.3)$$

Now we denote by $f_N(t,\, x)$ the probability density function of the diffusion process $x^N(\cdot)$ at time t with respect to the invariant measure dx, then the entropy of the system at time t can be written as

$$H_N(t) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^N} f_N(t,\, x) \log f_N(t,\, x) dx.$$

Note here that Assumption 2.4 just states $H_N(0) \leq CN$ for some C.

Proposition 3.3. *We have*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} H_N(t) \leq -4\mathcal{D}_N\left(f_N(t,\, \cdot)\right)$$

Proof. Since $f_N(t,\, x)$ solves the forward equation, we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} H_N(t) = -(\mathcal{U}_D(t) + \mathcal{U}_R(t)) \quad (3.4)$$

where

$$\mathcal{U}_D(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{\mathbb{T}^N} \frac{\sigma_{c(i)}^2}{2} \frac{|\nabla_i f_N(t,\, x)|^2}{f_N(t,\, x)} dx$$

$$\mathcal{U}_R(t) = \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{\lambda N \sigma_{c(i)}^2 \sigma_{c(j)}^2}{2} \int_{F_{ij}} \left((f_N)_{ij} - (f_N)_{ji}\right) \left(\log (f_N)_{ij} - \log (f_N)_{ji}\right)(t,\, x) dS_{ij}(x).$$

By the elementary inequality

$$(a-b)(\log a - \log b) \geq 4(\sqrt{a} - \sqrt{b})^2,$$

we can deduce

$$\mathcal{U}_R(t) \geq 2\lambda \sum_{i \neq j} N \sigma_{c(i)}^2 \sigma_{c(j)}^2 \int_{F_{ij}} \left\{ \sqrt{(f_N)_{ij}} - \sqrt{(f_N)_{ji}} \right\}^2 (t,\, x) dS_{ij}(x). \quad (3.5)$$

By (3.4) and (3.5), the proof is completed. □

Let us define

$$\bar{f}_N^{[t_1,\,t_2]}(x) = \frac{1}{t_2 - t_1}\int_{t_1}^{t_2} f_N(t,\,x)dt \tag{3.6}$$

for $0 \le t_1 < t_2 \le T$ which is the average of density function in the time window $[t_1,\,t_2]$. We write $\bar{f}_N^{[0,\,T]}$ by simply $\bar{f}_N$.

Corollary 3.4. *For $0 \le t_1 < t_2 \le T$, we have $\mathcal{D}_N(\bar{f}_N^{[t_1,\,t_2]}) \le \frac{C}{t_2 - t_1}N$ for some constant C which does not depend on t_1, t_2 and N.*

Proof. By the convexity of the Dirichlet form,

$$\mathcal{D}_N(\bar{f}_N^{[t_1,\,t_2]}) \le \frac{1}{t_2 - t_1}\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \mathcal{D}_N(f_N(t,\cdot))dt. \tag{3.7}$$

By Proposition 3.3, RHS can be bounded above by

$$-\frac{1}{4(t_2 - t_1)}\int_{t_1}^{t_2}\frac{\partial}{\partial t}H_N(t)dt = \frac{H_N(t_1) - H_N(t_2)}{4(t_2 - t_1)} \le \frac{H_N(0)}{4(t_2 - t_1)} \le \frac{CN}{t_2 - t_1}$$

where the last inequality is due to Assumption 2.4. □

3.1.2. *Tightness.* Let us denote the equilibrium process by $\mathbb{P}_N^{eq}$ which starts from the invariant measure dx(*cf.* Remark 3.2). We recall the Dirichlet form for one-component model [24]:

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_N(f) = \frac{1}{8}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\int_{\mathbb{T}^N}\frac{(\nabla_i f)^2}{f}dx + \frac{\lambda N}{2}\sum_{i\ne j}\int_{F_{ij}}\left(\sqrt{f_{ij}} - \sqrt{f_{ji}}\right)^2 dS_{ij}(x) \tag{3.8}$$

Note that this Dirichlet form is equivalent to ours in the sense that

$$\frac{1}{C_{\max}}\mathcal{D}_N(f) \le \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_N(f) \le \frac{1}{C_{\min}}\mathcal{D}_N(f) \tag{3.9}$$

where $C_{\min}$ and $C_{\max}$ are minimum and maximum element of $\{\sigma_1^2,\,\sigma_2^2,\,\sigma_1^4,\,\sigma_2^4,\,\sigma_1^2\sigma_2^2\}$, respectively. In Proposition 3.4 of [24], the exponential tightness of equilibrium one-component LIBM has been developed and the proof therein is entirely based on the Dirichlet form $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_N(\cdot)$. Accordingly, all the arguments are still valid for our model through equivalence (3.9). In this manner, we obtain the following *equilibrium* tightness result.

Proposition 3.5. *For any ϵ, $\alpha > 0$,*

$$\limsup_{\delta\to 0}\limsup_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}\log\mathbb{P}_N^{eq}\left[\left|\left\{i:\sup_{\substack{0\le s,t\le T\\ |s-t|\le\delta}}\left|x_i^N(t)-x_i^N(s)\right|\ge\epsilon\right\}\right|\ge N\alpha\right]=-\infty.$$

The super-exponential nature of this estimate allows us to develop the *non-equilibrium* tightness as follows.

Corollary 3.6. *For any ϵ, $\alpha > 0$,*

$$\limsup_{\delta\to 0}\limsup_{N\to\infty}\mathbb{P}_N\left[\left|\left\{i:\sup_{\substack{0\le s,t\le T\\ |s-t|\le\delta}}\left|x_i^N(t)-x_i^N(s)\right|\ge\epsilon\right\}\right|\ge N\alpha\right]=0. \tag{3.10}$$

Therefore, $\{\mathbb{Q}_N\}_{N=1}^{\infty}$ is a tight family on $C([0,T],\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbb{T})^2)$.

Proof. Let us denote the event

$$E_{N,\delta,\epsilon,\alpha}=\left\{\left|\left\{i:\sup_{\substack{0\le s,t\le T\\ |s-t|\le\delta}}\left|x_i^N(t)-x_i^N(s)\right|\ge\epsilon\right\}\right|\ge N\alpha\right\}$$

then Proposition 3.5 implies that $E_{N,\delta,\epsilon,\alpha}$ has a super-exponentially small probability in equilibrium. Now, by the elementary inequality (*cf.* Proposition 8.2 of Appendix 1 of [17]),

$$\mathbb{P}_N[E_{N,\delta,\epsilon,\alpha}]\le\frac{2+H[\mathbb{P}_N|\mathbb{P}_N^{eq}]}{\log\left(1+\frac{1}{\mathbb{P}_N^{eq}[E_{N,\delta,\epsilon,\alpha}]}\right)}\le\frac{2+CN}{-\log\mathbb{P}_N^{eq}[E_{N,\delta,\epsilon,\alpha}]} \tag{3.11}$$

where the second inequality follows from Assumption 2.4, the demonstration of (3.10) is completed.

We next prove the tightness of $\{\mathbb{Q}_N\}_{N=1}^{\infty}$. Since the domain $\mathcal{M}_1(\mathbb{T})$ is already compact, it suffices to check the modulus of continuity in the sense that □

$$\limsup_{\delta\to 0}\limsup_{N\to\infty}\mathbb{P}_N\left[\sup_{\substack{0\le s,t\le T\\ |s-t|\le\delta}}\frac{1}{N}\left|\sum_{i\in\mathcal{T}_c^N}\left(J(x_i^N(t))-J(x_i^N(s))\right)\right|\ge\epsilon\right]=0 \tag{3.12}$$

for $\epsilon > 0$, $c = 1, 2$ and smooth $J(\cdot)$. Note here that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}_N\left[\sup_{\substack{0\le s,t\le T\\ |s-t|\le\delta}}\frac{1}{N}\left|\sum_{i\in\mathcal{T}_c^N}\left(J(x_i^N(t))-J(x_i^N(s))\right)\right|\ge\epsilon\right]\\
&\le\mathbb{P}_N\left[\sup_{\substack{0\le s,t\le T\\ |s-t|\le\delta}}\frac{1}{N}\left|\sum_{i\in\mathcal{T}_c^N}\left|(x_i^N(t))-(x_i^N(s))\right|\right|\ge\epsilon'\right]\\
&\le\mathbb{P}_N\left[\sup_{\substack{0\le s,t\le T\\ |s-t|\le\delta}}\left|\left\{i:\sup_{\substack{0\le s,t\le T\\ |s-t|\le\delta}}\left|x_i^N(t)-x_i^N(s)\right|\ge\frac{\epsilon'}{2}\right\}\right|\ge\frac{N\epsilon'}{2}\right]
\end{aligned}$$

where $\epsilon' = \epsilon/\left\|J'\right\|_{L^\infty}$ and therefore (3.12) follows from (3.10).

3.1.3. *Auxiliary martingales.* Let us define an adapted process $z_k^N(t)$ by

$$z_k^N(t) = x_k^N(t) + \frac{\alpha}{N\sigma_1^2}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{T}_1^N}\nu(x_i^N(t)-x_k^N(t)) + \frac{\alpha}{N\sigma_2^2}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{T}_2^N}\nu(x_j^N(t)-x_k^N(t)) \tag{3.13}$$

where

$$\alpha = \left(\lambda + \frac{\bar\rho_1}{\sigma_1^2} + \frac{\bar\rho_2}{\sigma_2^2}\right)^{-1}$$

(*cf.* (2.11)) and $\nu(x) = x$ is a function on $[0,\,1]$ considered as a discontinuous function on $\mathbb{T}$. We claim that $\left\{z_k^N(t) - z_k^N(0) : t\in[0,\,T]\right\}$ is the martingale with respect to the filtration $\{\mathscr{F}_t\}$. To see this, define a function f on G_N by

$$f(x) = x_k + \frac{\alpha}{N\sigma_1^2}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{T}_1^N\setminus\{k\}}\nu(x_i-x_k) + \frac{\alpha}{N\sigma_2^2}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{T}_1^N\setminus\{k\}}\nu(x_j-x_k).$$

Then, it is straightforward to check that sum of all the terms except for $f(x^N(t)) - f(x^N(0))$ are 0 in (2.5), which implies that $z_k^N(t) - z_k^N(0)$ is a martingale. Moreover, by (2.6), this martingale can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
z_k^N(t) - z_k^N(0) =&\alpha\lambda\sigma_{c(k)}\beta_k(t) + \frac{\alpha}{N\sigma_1}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{T}_1^N}\beta_i(t) + \frac{\alpha}{N\sigma_2}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{T}_2^N}\beta_j(t)\\
&+\frac{\alpha}{N\sigma_1^2}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{T}_1^N}\left[M_{ik}^N(t)-M_{ki}^N(t)\right] + \frac{\alpha}{N\sigma_2^2}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{T}_2^N}\left[M_{jk}^N(t)-M_{kj}^N(t)\right].
\end{aligned}\tag{3.14}$$

As a result, the quadratic variation $\left\langle z_k^N,\, z_k^N \right\rangle_t$ can be written as

$$\lambda\alpha^2\sigma_{c(k)}^2 \left[\lambda t + \frac{1}{\sigma_1^2}A_{k,1}^N(t) + \frac{1}{\sigma_2^2}A_{k,2}^N(t)\right] + O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right)t \tag{3.15}$$

where $O(N^{-1})$ term is independent with t or k.

3.1.4. *Mollification of local times.* In the computation of the hydrodynamic limit, one important task is to approximate the somewhat noisy current terms by gradients in the spirit of [12, 27]. In the locally interacting model, the nature of the interaction is the reflection of Brownian motions and therefore the currents are necessarily expressed in terms of the local times, which is quite noisy. The bulk average of local times, however, can be controlled satisfactorily as carried out in [24]. The essence of such control is the mollification of the average of local times into the so-called local density. We state and prove this approximation procedure more rigorously, by first introducing the exact definition of the averaged local time and local density.

(1) For particle $x_i^N(\cdot)$ and type c, the averaged local time $A_{i,c}^N(t)$ is defined by

$$A_{i,c}^N(t) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{T}_c^N\setminus\{i\}}\left[A_{ij}^N(t) + A_{ji}^N(t)\right]. \tag{3.16}$$

(2) For $x = (x_1,\, x_2,\, \cdots,\, x_N) \in \mathbb{T}^N$, and the local density of type c around the particle $x_i(\cdot)$ is defined by

$$\rho_{i,\,c}^{N,\,\epsilon}(x) = \frac{1}{2N\epsilon}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{T}_c^N\setminus\{i\}}\chi_\epsilon(x_j - x_i) \tag{3.17}$$

for $\epsilon > 0$, where $\chi_\epsilon = \mathbb{1}_{[-\epsilon,\,\epsilon]}$ is the indicator function on $\mathbb{T}$.

Then, the main result is the following theorem.

Theorem 3.7. *For any c_1, c_2 and $\delta > 0$,*

$$\limsup_{\epsilon\to 0}\limsup_{N\to\infty}\mathbb{P}_N\left[\left|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{T}_{c_1}^N}\int_0^T h(t,\, z_i^N(t))\left[dA_{i,\,c_2}^N(t) - \rho_{i,\,c_2}^{N,\,\epsilon}(x^N(t))dt\right]\right| > \delta\right] = 0$$

where $h(\cdot,\,\cdot) \in C^{0,\,1}([0,\,T]\times\mathbb{T})$.

The proof is entirely based on the estimates in Section 2 of [24] and is given in Appendix.

3.2. **Hydrodynamic limit theory.**

3.2.1. *Energy estimate.* Before proving Theorem 3.7, we first prove that any weak limit of $\{\mathbb{Q}_N\}_{N=1}^{\infty}$ is concentrated on the absolutely continuous path, which also has finite energy in some appropriate sense.

Proposition 3.8. *Let $\mathbb{Q}_\infty$ be any weak limit of $\{\mathbb{Q}_N\}_{N=1}^{\infty}$. If $(\rho_1(\cdot,\, dx),\, \rho_2(\cdot,\, dx))^\dagger \in \mathrm{supp}\{\mathbb{Q}_\infty\}$, then*

$$\rho_1(t,\, dx) = \rho_1(t,\, x)dx, \quad \rho_2(t,\, dx) = \rho_2(t,\, x)dx \tag{3.18}$$

for some $\rho_1(\cdot,\, \cdot)$, $\rho_2(\cdot,\, \cdot) \in L^1([0,\, T] \times \mathbb{T})$ which are weakly continuous in t, weakly differentiable in x and satisfy energy estimate

$$\int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{(\nabla \rho)^2}{\rho} dxdt < \infty \tag{3.19}$$

where $\rho = \rho_1 + \rho_2$. In particular, $\rho_1,\, \rho_2 \in L^2([0,\, T] \times \mathbb{T})$.

Proof. It suffices to show that

$$\mathbb{E}_N \left[\int_0^T \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla \phi(x_i^N(t)) dt \right] \le C \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_N \left[\int_0^T \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \phi^2(x_i^N(t)) dt \right]} \tag{3.20}$$

for $\phi \in C^{0,\,1}([0,\, T] \times \mathbb{T})$. Indeed, it is standard (*e.g.*, [18]) that (3.20) implies that ρ is not only absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure but also has a weak derivative $\nabla \rho$ that satisfies (3.19). This energy estimate implies $\rho \in L^2(0,\, T,\, L^\infty(\mathbb{T}))$ as well(*e.g.*, see Lemma 4.3 of [24]) and therefore $\rho_1,\, \rho_2 \in L^2$.

We now prove the claim. The LHS of (3.20) can be computed as

$$\frac{T}{N} \int_{G_N} \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla \phi(x_i) \bar{f}_N(x) dx = -\frac{T}{N} \int_{G_N} \sum_{i=1}^N \phi(x_i) \nabla_i \bar{f}_N(x) dx \tag{3.21}$$

by Green's Theorem on the manifold G_N (*cf.* (2.5) of [24]). Note here that G_N has a non-trivial boundary and hence we would have boundary terms, which might be surface integrals on ∂G_N, due to the discontinuity of $\bar{f}_N$ along ∂G_N. However, these boundary terms have entirely disappeared since the integrations on F_{ij} and F_{ji} have canceled

each other. By Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality, the RHS of (3.21) can be bounded by

$$\frac{T}{N}\sqrt{\int_{\mathbb{T}}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\phi^2(x_i)\bar{f}_N(x)dx\int_{\mathbb{T}}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{(\nabla_i\bar{f}_N(x))^2}{\bar{f}_N(x)}dx} \tag{3.22}$$

and hence (3.20) follows from Corollary 3.4. □

3.2.2. *Proof of Theorem 2.5.* We first remark that for the one-component system, the uncolored empirical density has an obvious limit: the solution of the heat equation. This observation was crucial when we were developing the limit theory for the colored system. The following lemma substitutes this role of the heat equation in the two-component model.

Lemma 3.9. *Let $\mathbb{Q}_\infty$ be any weak limit of $\{\mathbb{Q}_N\}_{N=1}^{\infty}$. Then, any $(\rho_1(t,\,x)dx,\,\rho_2(t,\,x)dx)^\dagger \in \mathrm{supp}\{\mathbb{Q}_\infty\}$ satisfies the following equation*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(\frac{\rho_1(t,\,x)}{\sigma_1^2}+\frac{\rho_2(t,\,x)}{\sigma_2^2}\right)=\frac{1}{2}\Delta\rho(t,\,x) \tag{3.23}$$

in a weak sense where $\rho=\rho_1+\rho_2$.

Proof. For any $f\in C^{1,2}([0,\,T]\times\mathbb{T})$,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{1}{\sigma_{c(i)}^2}f(t,\,x_i^N(t))-\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{1}{\sigma_{c(i)}^2}f(0,\,x_i^N(0))\\ -\int_0^t\frac{1}{2N}\sum_{k=1}^{N}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t}+\frac{1}{2}\Delta\right)f(s,\,x_k^N(s))ds\end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

is a martingale by (2.6) and can be rewritten as

$$M_f(t)=\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{1}{\sigma_{c(i)}}\int_0^t\nabla f(s,\,x_i^N(s))d\beta_i(s)$$

Note that $\mathbb{E}[M_f^2(t)]=O(N^{-1})$ and hence (3.24) converges to 0 in probability as $N\to\infty$. This proves (3.23). □

Proof of Theorem 2.5. We start by applying Ito's formula to the density field of

$$\left\{z_i^N(\cdot):i\in\mathcal{T}_1^N\right\}$$

such that

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{T}_1^N} f(t,\, z_i^N(t)) - \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{T}_1^N} f(0,\, z_i^N(0)) = J_1(t) + J_2(t) + J_3(t) \tag{3.25}$$

where

$$J_1(t) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{T}_1^N}\int_0^t f_t(s,\, z_i^N(s))ds$$

$$J_2(t) = \frac{1}{2N}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{T}_1^N}\int_0^t f_{xx}(s,\, z_i^N(s))d\left\langle z_i^N,\, z_i^N\right\rangle_s$$

$$J_3(t) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{T}_1^N}\int_0^t f_x(s,\, z_i^N(s))dz_i^N(s)$$

for $f \in C^{1,2}([0,\, T]\times\mathbb{T})$. As usual, the martingale part $J_3(t)$ is negligible. To be more precise, by (3.14) and (3.15), we derive

$$\mathbb{E}_N[J_3^2(t)] \le \frac{C}{N}t + \frac{C}{N}\mathbb{E}_N\left[\frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{i\neq j} A_{ij}^N(t)\right] \tag{3.26}$$

where C is a constant independent of N. The last expectation can be written as

$$\frac{t}{N^2}\sum_{i\neq j}\int_{F_{ij}}\left(\bar{f}_N^{[0,t]}\right)_{ij}(x)dS_{ij} \tag{3.27}$$

where the notation f_{ij} follows from (2.1). By Lemma 2.5 of [24], (3.27) can be bounded by

$$\left(2+\sqrt{\frac{8\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_N\left(\bar{f}_N^{[0,t]}\right)}{N}}\right)t \le \left(2+\sqrt{\frac{8\mathcal{D}_N\left(\bar{f}_N^{[0,t]}\right)}{C_{\min}N}}\right)t \le \left(2+\sqrt{\frac{8C}{C_{\min}t}}\right)t$$

where the first and second inequalities follow from Corollary 3.4 and (3.9), respectively. Therefore, we can conclude that $J_3(t)$ is bounded in L^2 and hence Doob's inequality guarantees its negligibility.

We now consider the quadratic variation part in $J_2(t)$. By (3.15) and Theorem 3.7, we can approximate $d\left\langle z_i^N,\, z_i^N\right\rangle_s$ by

$$\lambda\alpha^2\sigma_{c(i)}^2\left[\lambda+\frac{(\mu_1^N(s)*\iota_\epsilon)(x_i^N(s))}{\sigma_1^2}+\frac{(\mu_2^N(s)*\iota_\epsilon)(x_i^N(s))}{\sigma_2^2}\right]ds \tag{3.28}$$

where $\iota_\epsilon(\cdot)=\frac{1}{2\epsilon}\chi_\epsilon(\cdot)$. Another observation is that we can write (3.13) in the form

$$z_i^N(t)=x_i^N(t)+\frac{\alpha}{\sigma_1^2}\left\langle\mu_1^N(t),\,\nu(\cdot-x_i^N(t))\right\rangle+\frac{\alpha}{\sigma_2^2}\left\langle\mu_2^N(t),\,\nu(\cdot-x_i^N(t))\right\rangle \tag{3.29}$$

where $\langle\mu,\, f\rangle=\int_{\mathbb{T}} f d\mu$. We now consider

$$F_{\rho_1,\rho_2}(t,\,x)=x+\alpha\int_{\mathbb{T}}\nu(y-x)\left(\frac{\rho_1(t,\,y)}{\sigma_1^2}+\frac{\rho_2(t,\,y)}{\sigma_2^2}\right)dy$$

for $\rho_1,\,\rho_2\in L^2$ and we temporarily simply write this function as $F(t,\,x)$. Note here that if we replace $\mu_c^N(t)$'s by $\rho_c(t,\,x)dx$'s in (3.29), then the RHS becomes $F(t,\,x_i^N(t))$. Based on this observation, we can combine (3.25), (3.26), (3.28), (3.29) and Proposition 3.8 such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{\epsilon\to0}\\
&\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_\infty\Bigg[\Bigg|(\rho_1(t,\,x)dx,\,\rho_2(t,\,x)dx)^\dagger:\\
&\qquad\int_{\mathbb{T}}f(T,\,F(T,\,x))\rho_1(T,\,x)dx-\int_{\mathbb{T}}f(0,\,F(0,\,x))\rho_1(0,\,x)dx\\
&\qquad-\int_0^T\int_{\mathbb{T}}\left[f_t+\frac{\lambda\alpha^2\sigma_1^2}{2}\left(\lambda+\frac{\rho_1*\iota_\epsilon}{\sigma_1^2}(s,\,x)+\frac{\rho_2*\iota_\epsilon}{\sigma_2^2}(s,\,x)\right)f_{xx}\right]\rho_1(s,\,x)dxdt\Bigg|>\delta\Bigg]=0
\end{aligned} \tag{3.30}$$

for any $\delta>0$ where f_t and f_{xx} at the last line are evaluated at $(s,\,F(s,\,x))$. By Proposition 3.8, we know that $\rho_c*\iota_\epsilon$ converges to ρ_c as $\epsilon\to0$ in L^2 and therefore we

have

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_\infty \Bigg[(\rho_1(t,\, x)dx,\, \rho_2(t,\, x)dx)^\dagger : \\ \int_{\mathbb{T}} f(T,\, F(T,\, x))\rho_1(T,\, x)dx - \int_{\mathbb{T}} (0,\, F(0,\, x))\rho_1(0,\, x)dx \\ - \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left[f_t + \frac{\lambda\alpha^2\sigma_1^2}{2} \left(\lambda + \frac{\rho_1}{\sigma_1^2} + \frac{\rho_2}{\sigma_2^2} \right) f_{xx} \cdot \right] \rho_1(s,\, x)dxdt = 0 \Bigg] = 0. \qquad (3.31)$$

Again, f_t and f_{xx} are evaluated at $(s,\, F(s,\, x))$. Therefore, we wish to replace $f(t,\, F(t,\, x))$ by $g(t,\, x) \in C^{1,\,2}([0,\, T] \times \mathbb{T})$ to conclude our derivation of equation (1.1). For this substitution, we first need the inverse of F which we obtain by first observing that

$$\frac{d}{dx} \left[\int_{\mathbb{T}} \nu(y - x) f(y) dy \right] = f(x) - \int_{\mathbb{T}} f(y) dy$$

for any $f \in L^1(\mathbb{T})$, and hence

$$F_x(t,\, x) = \alpha U(t,\, x) \geq \alpha\lambda > 0$$

where

$$U(t,\, x) = \lambda + \frac{\rho_1(t,\, x)}{\sigma_1^2} + \frac{\rho_2(t,\, x)}{\sigma_2^2}.$$

Thus, we have the inverse function of F which we denote by G. Of course, we hope to take $f(t,\, x) = g(t,\, G(t,\, x))$ for $g \in C^{1,\,2}$ which automatically implies $f(t,\, F(t,\, x)) = g(t,\, x)$. Note here that, our computations leading to (3.31) required $f \in C^{1,\,2}$ and therefore we should have $f,\, g \in C^{1,\,2}$ simultaneously. This is guaranteed if $\rho_1,\, \rho_2 \in C^{1,\,2}$, which implies $F \in C^{1,\,2}$ and hence $G \in C^{1,\,2}$.

We first consider this case *i.e.*, $\rho_1,\, \rho_2 \in C^{1,\,2}$. In this case, we start by computing derivatives of F and G. We start by

$$F_{xx}(t,\, x) = \alpha U_x(t,\, x)$$
$$F_t(t,\, x) = \frac{\alpha}{2} \rho_x(t,\, x)$$

where the computation of F_t follows from Lemma 3.9. Accordingly, we have

$$G_x(t,\, x) = \frac{1}{F_x(t,\, y)} = \frac{1}{\alpha U(t,\, y)}$$
$$G_{xx}(t,\, x) = -\frac{F_{xx}(t,\, y)}{F_x^3(t,\, y)} = -\frac{U_x(t,\, y)}{\alpha^2 U^3(t,\, y)}$$
$$G_t(t,\, x) = -\frac{F_t(t,\, y)}{F_x(t,\, y)} = -\frac{\rho_x(t,\, y)}{2U(t,\, y)}$$

where $y = F(t,\, x)$. Now, we substitute $f(t,\, x)$ in (3.31) by $g(t,\, G(t,\, x))$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_\infty \Bigg[& (\rho_1(t,\, x)dx,\, \rho_2(t,\, x)dx)^\dagger : \\ & \int_{\mathbb{T}} g(t,\, x)\rho_1(t,\, x)dx - \int_{\mathbb{T}} f(0,\, x)\rho_1(0,\, x)dx \\ & \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{T}} \left[g_t - \left(\frac{\rho_x}{2U} + \frac{\lambda\sigma_1^2 U_x}{2U^2} \right) g_x + \frac{\lambda\sigma_1^2}{2U} g_{xx} \right] \rho_1(s,\, x)dxdt = 0 \Bigg] = 1. \end{aligned} \tag{3.32}$$

If $\rho_1,\, \rho_2$ are not in $C^{1,2}([0,\, T] \times \mathbb{T})$, then we mollify them as $\rho_1 * \eta_\epsilon,\, \rho_2 * \eta_\epsilon$ by using smooth mollifiers $\{\eta_\epsilon\}_{\epsilon>0}$. Then, we apply the arguments above to $\rho_1 * \eta_\epsilon,\, \rho_2 * \eta_\epsilon$. Ultimately, we allow $\epsilon \to 0$ to obtain (3.32). The precise argument of this procedure can be found in Lemma 4.12 of [24].

In particular, (3.32) proves equation for ρ_1(*i.e.*, the first coordinate) in (1.1). The equation for ρ_2 can be proven by the same manner. Therefore, the identification of limit points as the weak solution of (1.1) with initial condition $\tilde{\rho}^0(x)$ is completed.

We postpone the discussion of the uniqueness of such a weak solution to the next section. □

4. Uniqueness

4.1. **Revisit: colored system.** We start by considering the colored system. At the time when this paper was written, there existed three limit theories for the two-color system(SSEP [21], ZRP [6] and LIBM [24]). These three models share the same form of hydrodynamic limit. Stating this succinctly, the evolution of the limiting particle densities $\rho_1,\, \rho_2$ of the two colors are obtained as the solution of the following PDE:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\begin{pmatrix}\rho_1\\ \rho_2\end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2}\nabla\cdot\left[\begin{pmatrix}\frac{\rho_1}{\rho}D(\rho)+\frac{\rho_2}{\rho}S(\rho) & \frac{\rho_1}{\rho}(D(\rho)-S(\rho))\\ \frac{\rho_2}{\rho}(D(\rho)-S(\rho)) & \frac{\rho_2}{\rho}D(\rho)+\frac{\rho_1}{\rho}S(\rho)\end{pmatrix}\nabla\begin{pmatrix}\rho_1\\ \rho_2\end{pmatrix}\right]. \tag{4.1}$$

We briefly explain this equation:

- $\rho = \rho_1 + \rho_2$ is the uncolored limiting density
- $D(\rho)$ is the bulk-diffusion coefficient, *i.e.*, ρ is the solution of

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{2}\nabla\cdot[D(\rho)\nabla\rho]. \tag{4.2}$$

  We can also derive this equation from (4.1) by simply adding two equations in (4.1).
- $S(\rho)$ is the self-diffusion coefficient in the equilibrium with density ρ.

This kind of universality is an interesting feature of the theory of interacting particle systems. In particular, we can conclude the non-equilibrium behavior of the tagged particle, the so-called propagation of chaos [22], from a result such as this for the colored result. We stress here that the uniqueness of equation (4.1) is not a significant issue. This becomes obvious when we substitute $\rho_2 = \rho - \rho_1$ in the first equation of (4.1) to obtain

$$\frac{\partial \rho_1}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{2}\nabla\cdot\left[S(\rho)\nabla\rho_1 + \frac{(D(\rho)-S(\rho))\nabla\rho}{\rho}\rho_1\right]. \tag{4.3}$$

Since ρ is the solution of master equation (4.2), we can simply regard (4.3) as a linear parabolic PDE. Thus, under appropriate initial conditions and the non-degeneracy of $S(\cdot)$, the uniqueness is automatically guaranteed.

Remark 4.1. We can observe an interesting property of the particle system from (4.2) and (4.3); *the diffusivity of the colored portion of the system is not governed by the bulk-diffusion coefficient $D(\cdot)$ but by self-diffusion coefficient $S(\cdot)$ only.*

Remark 4.2. An m-color system with $m \geq 3$ produce exactly the same result; (4.3) does not depend on the number of colors we used.

Now we consider our equation (1.1) for the two-component system. In this case, due to the inhomogeneity of mechanical properties of particles, the substitutive master equation (3.23) is not closed itself. Accordingly, an iterative strategy for solving the colored system is unavailable and instead, we have to confront the system of equation

(1.1) in a direct manner. Remark that the quasi-linear parabolic equation of the form (1.1) is known as a *cross-diffusion equation.*

4.2. **Uniqueness.** The general theory for a cross-diffusion system was thoroughly explained in [1]. In this section, we use this general theory to develop the local uniqueness of (1.1).

Let us consider an n-dimensional quasi-linear equation

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} = \text{div} \cdot [A(\mathbf{u})\nabla \mathbf{u}] \tag{4.4}$$

where $\mathbf{u}(\cdot)$ is an n-dimensional vector function and $A(\cdot)$ is an $n \times n$ matrix functional. In most physical situations of multi-component diffusive flow(*e.g.,* [1, 3, 8, 14, 25, 29] and models therein) the diffusion matrix $A(\mathbf{u})$ is neither symmetric nor positive semi-definite. Instead, it becomes evident that the physically relevant condition for $A(\mathbf{u})$ is normally elliptic:

Definition 4.3. A square matrix M is considered *normally elliptic* if all of its eigenvalues have a positive real part. Equation (4.4) is considered normally elliptic if $A(\mathbf{u})$ is normally elliptic for all $\mathbf{u}$.

The normally elliptic parabolic equation differs intrinsically from the uniformly elliptic one. On the one hand, [26] suggested examples of normally elliptic equations without the maximum principle or even worse than that, equation that *blow up* in finite time. On the other hand, the experiment conducted by [4] for a three-component system (two bulbs filled with H_2, N_2, and CO_2) shows qualitatively different behavior in its evolution to the Fickian regime. The reason is that this system is governed by the normally elliptic equation.

The normally elliptic equation has been analyzed in [1], in which local existence and uniqueness of solution were obtained. In particular, the following theorem is a direct consequence of Theorems 14.4, 14.6 and 15.1 of [1]

Theorem 4.4. *For each $\tilde{\rho}^0$ that satisfies Assumption 2.2, there exist $t^+(\tilde{\rho}^0) > 0$ such that the equation (2.13) has a unique weak non-negative solution $\tilde{\rho}(t, x)$ in $t \in [0, t^+(\tilde{\rho}^0)]$. Furthermore, this solution is strong in $[0, t^+(\tilde{\rho}^0)]$.*

Proof. The normally ellipticity of $D(\rho_1, \rho_2)$ of (2.14) is obvious since both of its trace and determinant are positive. We note here that the condition $\tilde{\rho}^0 \in W_1^p$ for some $p > 2$ in assumption 2.2 is used here for satisfying the condition of Theorem 14.4 of [1]. □

In particular, this proposition proves the part (1) of Theorem (2.5).

Remark 4.5. As we can anticipate from the peculiar behaviors of the solution of certain examples in [26], the analysis of equation (4.4) is much more delicate than for usual parabolic equations. In particular, without the *a priori* uniform (in time) control of the Hölder norm[4] (*cf.* Theorem 14.4 of [1]), the global existence and uniqueness is not guaranteed. In particular, [26] presented a corresponding counter-example.

4.3. **Maxwell-Stefan equation.** Of course, the equation (2.13) is not only an ordinary normally elliptic equation but also has some underlying physical structures, which may hopefully be exploited to develop a more concrete result than the result we obtained in the previous section. In fact, in addition to this we have that: (2.13) is equivalent to the Maxwell-Stefan equation [20]. As the experiment of [4] highlighted, the Maxwell-Stefan regime is qualitatively different to the Fickian regime; hence, its analytical properties should also be studied independently. Recently, there has been some progress in this direction *e.g.*, [14, 15].

We first provide cursory introduction to the Maxwell-Stefan equation and refer to [2, 14, 15] for a detailed exposition of this equation. In particular, [2] contains the physical derivation of the equation. Our outline follows mostly that of [14]. In principle, the Maxwell-Stefan equation describes the diffusive behavior of multi-component gaseous mixtures. If the system consists of n components, the equation is given by

$$\frac{\partial c_i}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot J_i + r_i(c_1, c_2, \cdots, c_n) \tag{4.5}$$

$$\nabla c_i = -\sum_{j:j\neq i} \frac{c_j J_i - c_i J_j}{D_{ij}} \tag{4.6}$$

for $i = 1, 2, \cdots, n$ where

- c_i represents the molar concentration of the ith component and we assume $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i \equiv 1$. Therefore, the true dimension of this equation is $n - 1$.

[4] Of course, we barely have such an *a priori* estimate

- J_i denotes the flux of the ith component and satisfies $\sum_{i=1}^{n} J_i \equiv 0$. Note that, at least in principle, we can recover the values of J_i as a function of the values of c_i from (4.6).
- r_i is the production rate of the ith component and satisfies $\sum_{i=1}^{n} r_i \equiv 0$.
- $D_{ij} > 0 (i \neq j)$ is the (constant) binary diffusion coefficient between ith and jth component and $D_{ij} = D_{ji}$(momentum conservation). This is also called Maxwell-Stefan diffusivity.

Let us consider the ternary system, *i.e.*, $n = 3$, with $r_i \equiv 0$ for all i. We substitute $c_3 = 1 - c_1 - c_2$ and solve (4.6) for all J_i. Then, we insert the obtained values of J_i into (4.5) to derive

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\begin{pmatrix} c_1 \\ c_2 \end{pmatrix} = \nabla \cdot \left[A(c_1,\, c_2) \nabla \begin{pmatrix} c_1 \\ c_2 \end{pmatrix} \right] \tag{4.7}$$

where

$$A(c_1,\, c_2) = \frac{1}{f(c_1,\, c_2)} \begin{pmatrix} D_{23} + (D_{12} - D_{23})c_1 & (D_{12} - D_{13})c_1 \\ (D_{12} - D_{23})c_2 & D_{13} + (D_{12} - D_{13})c_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

with

$$f(c_1,\, c_2) = D_{13}D_{23} + D_{13}(D_{12} - D_{23})c_1 + D_{23}(D_{12} - D_{13})c_2.$$

We remark here that this kind of simple derivation procedure is invalid for $n \geq 4$ and refer to Section 2 of [15] for the details.

Now we substitute

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1 &= kD_{13}(D_{12} - D_{23})c_1 \\ \rho_2 &= kD_{23}(D_{12} - D_{13})c_2 \\ \lambda &= kD_{13}D_{23} \\ \sigma_1^2 &= D_{13}^{-1} \\ \sigma_2^2 &= D_{23}^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

for any $k > 0$, then it becomes evident that equation (4.7) becomes exactly our main equation (1.1). Therefore we can regard our equation as the ternary Maxwell-Stefan equation. Based on the multi-component nature of our model, this equivalence is quite natural.

An important feature of the Maxwell-Stefan equation is its *entropy structure*, that is

$$A(c_1,\, c_2) = S(c_1,\, c_2)\chi(c_1,\, c_2)$$

where $\chi(\cdot,\, \cdot)$ is the Hessian of entropy functional and $S(\cdot,\, \cdot)$ is a positive-definite and symmetric[5]. In principle, this follows from the Onsager reciprocity. Most analytical results are based on this observation. In particular, [14] proved the global existence of the weak solution and its exponential decay to the steady state. [15] developed the boundedness of this global solution. However, as Jüngel pointed out in Section 6 of [15], the global uniqueness of the Maxwell-Stefan equation with a general initial condition is known to be a delicate and open problem. Accordingly, the global uniqueness of the Maxwell-Stefan equation is only known for the near-equilibrium case (Theorem 9.4.1 of [8]) and we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 4.6. *Under Assumption 2.3, there exists a unique global weak solution of (2.13).*

We remark that this result was originally proved in [16]. The proof along with the non-trivial way to derive the constant $\epsilon(\lambda,\, \sigma_1,\, \sigma_2)$ is presented in Section 9.4 of [8]. This proves the (2) of Theorem 2.5.

5. Concluding Remarks

We now discuss the extendability of our result.

Propagation of chaos. The standard way to prove the propagation of chaos is to use the coloring argument [21, 22]. Suppose that we painted the particles of type 1 in several colors, namely 1, 2, $\cdots$, k. Then, in fact, the argument of Section 3.2.2 is sufficiently robust to derive the hydrodynamic limit equation of these colors for smooth initial conditions as Assumptions 2.2 or 2.3. However, the coloring argument requires a more general initial condition, in particular, of the form $\mathbb{1}_A\rho_0^1(x)$ for measurable set A. We certainly do not have this kind of result. However, we remark here that, since we have already shown the tightness of the empirical process (Corollary 3.6), the general uniqueness theory of the Maxwell-Stefan equation directly implies the propagation of

[5]This automatically implies the normal ellipticity of the diffusion matrix.

chaos for our model. More precisely, the pair of empirical process

$$\left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_1^N} \delta_{x_i(\cdot)},\ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_2^N} \delta_{x_i(\cdot)} \right)$$

converges to the independent diffusions $(P_1,\ P_2)$ where the generators of $P_1,\ P_2$ are given by

$$\mathcal{L}^{(1)}_{\rho_1,\rho_2} = \frac{\lambda\sigma_1^2}{2U}\Delta - \frac{(\lambda+U)\nabla\rho_1 + \left(\lambda\frac{\sigma_1^2}{\sigma_2^2}+U\right)\nabla\rho_2}{2U^2}\nabla$$

$$\mathcal{L}^{(2)}_{\rho_1,\rho_2} = \frac{\lambda\sigma_2^2}{2U}\Delta - \frac{\left(\lambda\frac{\sigma_2^2}{\sigma_1^2}+U\right)\nabla\rho_1 + (\lambda+U)\nabla\rho_2}{2U^2}\nabla$$

where $U(t,\ x) = \lambda + \frac{\rho_1}{\sigma_1^2} + \frac{\rho_2}{\sigma_2^2}$, respectively.

General multi-component model. The core machinery for proving the hydrodynamic limit was the martingale $z_k^N(t)$ defined in Section 3.1.3. In general, for an m-component model($cf.$ Remark 2.1), one may expect

$$z_k^N(t) = x_k^N(t) + \sum_{c=1}^{m} \frac{\alpha}{N\sigma_c^2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_c^N} \nu(x_i^N(t) - x_k^N(t))$$

where

$$\alpha = \left(\lambda + \sum_{c=1}^{m} \frac{\bar{\rho}_c}{\sigma_c^2} \right)^{-1}$$

to be a martingale and therefore to have a similar result. However, this is a martingale(even after adjusting $\lambda_{c,\,c}$ appropriately) if and only if we have

$$\lambda_{c_1,\,c_2} = \lambda\sigma_{c_1}^2\sigma_{c_2}^2\ ;\ c_1 \neq c_2 \tag{5.1}$$

for some $\lambda > 0$. Under this condition, $z_k^N(t)$ is a martingale when we set $\lambda_{c,\,c} = \lambda\sigma_c^4$ for all c; thus, we have the hydrodynamic limit result. The limiting particle density of m-component $\tilde{\rho} = (\rho_1,\ \rho_2,\ \cdots,\ \rho_m)^\dagger$ is given by

$$\frac{\partial\tilde{\rho}}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{2}\nabla \cdot [D(\tilde{\rho})\nabla\tilde{\rho}]$$

where the cross-diffusion equation is given by

$$D(\tilde{\rho})_{ij} = \frac{\rho_i + \delta_{ij}\lambda\sigma_i^2}{\lambda + \sum_{c=1}^m \frac{\rho_c}{\sigma_c^2}}$$

where δ_{ij} is Kronecker's delta. The uniqueness result is the same as Theorems 4.4 and 4.6. However, condition (5.1) is somewhat unnatural in the physical sense and seems to be irrelevant. The scaling limit without this condition is an open question.

Appendix: Proof of Theorem 3.7

In this appendix, the proof of Theorem 3.7 relying on the estimates in Section 2 of [24], in particular Lemmas 2.6, 2.7 and 2.10, is given. The following is the main estimate.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\mathscr{P}_N$ be a class of non-negative function $f \in \bar{C}(G_N)$ such that $\int_{G_N} f(x)dx = 1$. Then, for any $f \in \mathscr{P}_N$ and $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1}{4}$,*

$$\frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{i\neq j}\left|\int_{G_N} h(z_i)f(x)\frac{\chi_\epsilon(x_j - x_i)}{2\epsilon}dx - \frac{1}{2}\int_{F_{ij}} h(z_i)\left(f_{ij}(x) + f_{ji}(x)\right)dS_{ij}(x)\right| \leq C\left[1 + \left(\frac{\mathcal{D}_N(f)}{N}\right)^{\frac{7}{8}}\right]\left(\epsilon^{\frac{1}{4}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\right). \quad (5.2)$$

where $h \in C^1(\mathbb{T})$ and

$$z_k = x_k + \frac{\alpha}{N\sigma_1^2}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{T}_1^N\setminus\{k\}}\nu(x_i - x_k) + \frac{\alpha}{N\sigma_2^2}\sum_{j\in\mathcal{T}_2^N\setminus\{k\}}\nu(x_j - x_k)$$

with $\alpha = \left(\lambda + \frac{\bar{\rho}_1}{\sigma_1^2} + \frac{\bar{\rho}_2}{\sigma_2^2}\right)^{-1}$. The constant C only depends on h.

Proof. Let us define a function g_ϵ on $[0, 1]$ as

$$g_\epsilon(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{x}{2\epsilon} - \frac{1}{2} & \text{for } 0 \leq x \leq \epsilon \\ 0 & \text{for } \epsilon \leq x \leq 1-\epsilon \\ \frac{x-1}{2\epsilon} + \frac{1}{2} & \text{for } 1-\epsilon \leq x \leq 1 \end{cases}$$

and a vector field $\mathbf{V}(x) = g_\epsilon(x_i - x_j)e_j$. Note that $g'_\epsilon(\cdot) = \frac{1}{2\epsilon}\chi_\epsilon(\cdot)$ and thus by Green's formula($cf.$ Section 2.2.1 of [24]),

$$\int_{G_N} \nabla_j f(x) \left[h(z_i)g_\epsilon(x_i - x_j)\right] dx = J_1 + J_2 + J_3 + J_4 \tag{5.3}$$

for $i \neq j$ where

$$J_1 = \int_{G_N} f(x)h(z_i)\frac{1}{2\epsilon}\chi_\epsilon(x_i - x_j)dx$$

$$J_2 = \int_{G_N} f(x)\left[\frac{\alpha}{N\sigma^2_{c(j)}}h'(z_i)\right] g_\epsilon(x_i - x_j)dx$$

$$J_3 = \int_{F_{ji}} f_{ji}(x)h(z_i)g_\epsilon(x_i - x_j)dS_{ji}(x) - \int_{F_{ij}} f_{ij}(x)h(z_i)g_\epsilon(x_i - x_j)dS_{ij}(x)$$

$$J_4 = \sum_{k:k\neq i,\,j}\left[\int_{F_{jk}} f_{jk}(x)h(z_i)g_\epsilon(x_i - x_j)dS_{jk}(x) - \int_{F_{kj}} f_{kj}(x)h(z_i)g_\epsilon(x_i - x_j)dS_{kj}(x)\right]$$

Note here that J_1 and J_2 are consequence of integration by part and J_3 and J_4 are corresponding boundary terms on $\{F_{ji},\, F_{ij}\}$ and $\{F_{jk},\, F_{kj} : k \neq j,\, i\}$, respectively.

Since $g_\epsilon(x_i - x_j) = \frac{1}{2}$ on F_{ij} and $-\frac{1}{2}$ on F_{ji},

$$\begin{aligned} J_3 &= -\frac{1}{2}\int_{F_{ji}} h(z_i)f_{ji}(x)dS_{ji}(x) - \frac{1}{2}\int_{F_{ij}} h(z_i)f_{ij}(x)dS_{ij}(x). \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\int_{F_{ij}} h(z_i)\left(f_{ij}(x) + f_{ji}(x)\right)dS_{ij}(x). \end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

For J_4, $h(z_i)g_\epsilon(x_i - x_j)$ has same value on F_{jk} and F_{kj} and therefore

$$J_4 = \sum_{k:k\neq i,\,j}\left[\int_{F_{jk}} (f_{jk}(x) - f_{kj}(x))h(z_i)g_\epsilon(x_i - x_j)dS_{jk}(x)\right]. \tag{5.5}$$

Now, we can combine (5.4), (5.5) with (5.3) to bound the LHS of (5.2) by $J_5+J_6+J_7$ where

$$J_5 = \frac{\|h\|_{L^\infty}}{N^2} \sum_{i\neq j} \int_{G_N} |\nabla_j f(x)|\, |g_\epsilon(x_i - x_j)|\, dx$$

$$J_6 = \frac{\alpha}{\min\{\sigma_1^2,\, \sigma_2^2\}} \cdot \frac{\|h'\|_{L^\infty}}{N^3} \sum_{i\neq j} \sum_{k:k\neq i,\, j} \int_{G_N} f(x)\, |g_\epsilon(x_i - x_j)|\, dx$$

$$J_7 = \frac{\|h\|_{L^\infty}}{N^2} \sum_{i\neq j} \sum_{k:k\neq i,\, j} \int_{F_{jk}} |f_{jk}(x) - f_{kj}(x)|\, |g_\epsilon(x_i - x_j)|\, dS_{jk}(x)$$

Note that J_5, J_6 and J_7 correspond to the LHS of (5.3), J_2 and J_4, respectively. By an elementary inequality $|g_\epsilon(\cdot)| \le \frac{1}{2}\chi_\epsilon(\cdot)$, we obtain

$$J_5 \le \frac{C}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{G_N} |\nabla_i f(x)|\, M_{\epsilon,i}(x) dx$$

$$J_6 \le \frac{C}{N^3} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{G_N} f(x) M_{\epsilon,i}(x) dx$$

$$J_7 \le \frac{C}{N^2} \sum_{i\neq j} \int_{F_{jk}} |f_{ij}(x) - f_{ij}(x)|\, M_{\epsilon,i}(x) dS_{ij}(x)$$

where $M_{i,\,\epsilon}(x) = \sum_{j:j\neq i} \chi_\epsilon(x_j - x_i)$. Now, the proof is completed by Lemmas 2.6, 2.7 and 2.10 of [24] with the equivalence (3.9). □

The following theorem is the super-exponential counterpart of Theorem 3.7 in equilibrium.

Theorem 5.2. *For any c_1, c_2 and $\delta > 0$,*

$$\limsup_{\epsilon\to 0} \limsup_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}_N^{eq} \left[\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i\in\mathcal{T}_{c_1}^N} \int_0^T h(t,\, z_i^N(t)) \left[dA_{i,\,c_2}^N(t) - \rho_{i,\,c_2}^{N,\,\epsilon}(x^N(t)) dt \right] \right| > \delta \right] = -\infty \quad (5.6)$$

where $h(\cdot,\, \cdot) \in C^{0,\,1}([0,\, T] \times \mathbb{T})$.

Proof. Since we can approximate $h(t,\, x)$ by functions of the form

$$\tilde{h}(t,\, x) = \sum_{i=0}^{M} \mathbb{1}_{[t_i,\, t_{i+1}]}(t) h(t_i,\, x)$$

where $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_{M+1} = T$, it suffices to show

$$\limsup_{\epsilon \to 0} \limsup_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}_N^{eq} \left[\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_{c_1}^N} \int_0^T h(z_i^N(t)) \left[dA_{i,\, c_2}^N(t) - \rho_{i,\, c_2}^{N,\, \epsilon}(x^N(t)) dt \right] \right| > \delta \right] = -\infty.$$

Let us simply denote the event inside $\mathbb{P}_N^{eq}$ as $E(N,\, h,\, \epsilon,\, \delta)$. Then, by Chebyshev's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{P}_N^{eq} \left[E(N,\, h,\, \epsilon,\, \delta) \right] \\ &\leq -a\delta + \frac{1}{N} \log \mathbb{E}_N^{eq} \exp \left\{ a \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_{c_1}^N} \left| \int_0^T h(z_i^N(t)) \left[dA_{i,\, c_2}^N(t) - \rho_{i,\, c_2}^{N,\, \epsilon}(x^N(t)) dt \right] \right| \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

for any $a > 0$ where $\mathbb{E}_N^{eq}$ is the expectation with respect to $\mathbb{P}_N^{eq}$. Observe here that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_N^{eq} \exp \left\{ a \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_{c_1}^N} \left| \int_0^T h(z_i^N(t)) \left[dA_{i,\, c_2}^N(t) - \rho_{i,\, c_2}^{N,\, \epsilon}(x^N(t)) dt \right] \right| \right\} \\ &\leq \sum_{e_i = \pm 1 \, \forall i} \mathbb{E}_N^{eq} \exp \left\{ a \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_{c_1}^N} e_i \int_0^T h(z_i^N(t)) \left[dA_{i,\, c_2}^N(t) - \rho_{i,\, c_2}^{N,\, \epsilon}(x^N(t)) dt \right] \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

By Feynman-Kac's formula,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_N^{eq} \exp \left\{ a \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T}_{c_1}^N} e_i \int_0^T h(z_i^N(t)) \left[dA_{i,\, c_2}^N(t) - \rho_{i,\, c_2}^{N,\, \epsilon}(x^N(t)) dt \right] \right\} \\ &\leq \exp\{T \lambda_{h,N,\epsilon,a}\} \end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

where $\lambda_{h,N,\epsilon,a}$ is the largest eigenvalue of the operator

$$\mathscr{L}_N + \frac{a}{N}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{T}_{c_1}^N}\left[e_i\cdot h(z_i)\sum_{j\in\mathcal{T}_{c_2}^N}\left\{\frac{\chi_\epsilon(x_j-x_i)}{2\epsilon}-\delta^+(x_j-x_i)-\delta^+(x_i-x_j)\right\}\right].$$

The variational formula for $\lambda_{h,N,\epsilon,a}$ is $\sup_{f\in\mathscr{P}_N}$ of

$$\left\{\frac{a}{N}\sum_{i\in\mathcal{T}_{c_1}^N, j\in\mathcal{T}_{c_2}^N} e_i\left[\int_{G_N} f(x)h(z_i)\frac{\chi_\epsilon(x_j-x_i)}{2\epsilon}dx \right.\right.$$
$$\left.\left. -\frac{1}{2}\int_{F_{ij}} h(z_i)\left(f_{ij}(x)+f_{ji}(x)\right)dS_{ij}(x)\right] - \mathcal{D}_N(f)\right\}.$$

By Lemma 5.1, we can bound this by

$$N\left[Ca\left(1+\left(\frac{\mathcal{D}_N(f)}{N}\right)^{\frac{7}{8}}\right)\left(\epsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\right)-\frac{\mathcal{D}_N(f)}{N}\right] \tag{5.10}$$

for some constant C which depends only on h. By an elementary inequality

$$cx^{\frac{7}{8}}-x\le\frac{7^7}{8^8}c^8,$$

we can bound (5.10) by

$$CN\left[a\left(\epsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\right)+a^8\left(\epsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\right)^8\right]. \tag{5.11}$$

Being independent of f, (5.11) provides a bound for $\lambda_{h,N,\epsilon,a}$ and therefore a we can bound (5.9) by

$$\exp\left\{CNT\left[a\left(\epsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\right)+a^8\left(\epsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\right)^8\right]\right\}. \tag{5.12}$$

Finally, by (5.8), we can bound (5.7) by

$$-a\delta+\log 2+CT\left[a\left(\epsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\right)+a^8\left(\epsilon^{\frac{1}{4}}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\right)^8\right]$$

and therefore

$$\limsup_{\epsilon\to 0}\limsup_{N\to 0}\frac{1}{N}\log\mathbb{P}_N^{eq}\left[E(N,\,h,\,\epsilon)\right]\le -a\delta+\log 2.$$

This completes the proof since a was an arbitrary positive number. □

Theorem 3.7 is a direct consequence of the previous theorem through the identical argument with (3.11).

Acknowledgement. The author would like to thank Professor S. R. S. Varadhan for numerous valuable discussions, and Professor Ansgar Jüngel of Vienna University of Technology for many helpful comments regarding the cross-diffusion equation, especially for the material in Section 4. The author also acknowledges support from Samsung Scholarship.

References

[1] Amann, H. (1993). Nonhomogeneous linear and quasilinear elliptic and parabolic boundary value problems, in "Schmeisser/Triebel: Function Spaces, Differential Operators and Nonlinear Analysis," Teubner Texte zur Mathematik, 133, 9-126.

[2] Bothe, D. (2011) On the Maxwell-Stefan equations to multicomponent diffusion. In: Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, 82-93, Springer, Basel.

[3] Boudin, L., Götz, D., Grec., B. (2010). Diffusion models of multicomponent mixtures in the lung. ESAIM Proceedigns 30, 91-104.

[4] Duncan, J., Toor, H. (1962). An experimental study of three component gas diffusion. AIChE Journal 8, 38-41.

[5] Feng, S., Grigorescu, I., Quastel, J. (2004). Diffusive scaling limit of mutually interacting particle systems. SIAM J. Math. Anal. Vol. 35(6), 1512-1533.

[6] Gabrielli, D., Jona-Lasinio, G., Landim, C. (1996). Onsager reciprocity relations without microscopic reversibility. Phys. Rev. Lett., 77. 1202-1205.

[7] Gabrielli, D., Jona-Lasinio, G., Landim, C. (1999). Onsager Symmetry from Microscopic TP Invariance. J. Stat. Phys. Vol., 96, 639-652

[8] Giovangigli. V. (1999). Multicomponent Flow Modeling. Birkhäuser.

[9] Grigorescu, I. (1999). Self-diffusion for Brownian motions with local interaction. Ann. Probab. 27, 1208-1267.

[10] Grigorescu, I. (1999). Uniqueness of the tagged particle process in a system with local interactions. Ann. Probab. 27. 1268-1282.

[11] Großkinsky, S., Spohn, H. (2003). Stationary measures and hydrodynamics of zero range processes with several species of particles. Bull. Braz. Math. Soc., New Series 34(3), 489-507.

[12] Guo, M. Z., Papanicolau, G. C., Varadhan, S. R. S. (1988). Nonlinear diffusion limit for a system with nearest neighbour interactions, Comm. Math. Phys. 118, 31-59.

[13] Ikeda, N., Watanabe, S. (1981). Stochastic Differential Equations and Diffusion Processes. North-Holland, Amsterdam.

[14] Jüngel, A., Stelzer, I.V. (2013). Existence analysis of Maxwell-Stefan systems for multicomponent mixtures. SIAM J. Math. Anal. 45(4), 2421–2440.

[15] Jüngel, A. (2015). The boundedness-by-entropy principle for cross-diffusion systems. Nonlinearity, 28(6), 1963-2001.

[16] Kawashima, S. (1984). Systems of a Hyperbolic-Parabolic Composite Type, with Applications to the Equations of Magnetohydrodynamics, Doctoral Thesis, Kyoto University.

[17] Kipnis, C., Landim, C. (1999). Scaling Limits of Interacting Particle Systems. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften 320. Springer, Berlin.

[18] Kipnis, C., Olla, S., Varadhan, S.R.S. (1989). Hydrodynamics and Large Deviation for Simple Exclusion Processes. Comm. Pure and Appl. Math. 42, 115–137.

[19] Kipnis, C., Varadhan, S. R. S., (1986). Central limit theorem for additive functionals of reversible markov process and applications to simple exclusions. Comm. Math. Phys. 104, 1-19.

[20] Maxwell, C. (1866). On the dynamical theory of gases. Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. London 157, 49-88.

[21] Quastel, J. (1992). Diffusion of color in the simple exclusion process. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 45, 623-679.

[22] Rezakhanlou, F. (1994). Propagation of chaos for symmetric simple exclusion. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 117, 943-957.

[23] Sasada, M. (2010). Hydrodynamic limit for two-component exclusion processes. Stoch. Proc. Appl. 120, 494-521.

[24] Seo, I. (2015). Large deviation principle for interacting Brownam motions. arXiv:1503.02035, To appear in Comm. Pure Appl. Math.

[25] Shigesada, N., Kawasaki, K. and Teramoto, E. (1979). Spacial segregation of interacting species. J. theor. Biology, 79 , 83-99.

[26] Stara, J. and John, O. (1995) Some (new) counterexamples of parabolic systems. Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin. 36, 503-510.

[27] Varadhan, S. R. S. (1990). Nonlinear diffusion limit for a system with nearest neighbour interactions II, in Asymptotic Problems in Probability Theory; Stochastic Models and Diffusions on Fractals. Proceedings of the Taniguchi Symposium, Sanda and Kyoto, 75-130, Longman, Essex, England.

[28] Varadhan, S. R. S. (1991). Scaling limits for interacting diffusions. Comm. Math. Phys. 135, 313-353.

[29] Wesselingh, J., Krishna., R. (2000) Mass Transfer in Multicomponent Mixtures. Delft University Press, Delft.

Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University
E-mail address: insuk@cims.nyu.edu